



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/786,221	-	02/24/2004	Daryl U. Lang	4366-147	3034	
48500	7590	08/25/2005		EXAMINER		
SHERIDA 1560 BROA		P.C. SUITE 1200	SMITH, CREIGHTON H			
DENVER,	,		•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
				2645		
				DATE MAIL ED: 08/25/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/786,221	LANG, DARYL U.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Creighton H. Smith	2645					
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
	nis action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
<ul> <li>5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6) Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-22,24 and 25</u> is/are rejected</li> <li>7) Claim(s) <u>10 and 23</u> is/are objected to.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1-9,11-22,24 and 25 is/are rejected.</li> </ul>						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		* *					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	, , ,	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applicat riority documents have been receive eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)	<u>_</u>						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D						
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>24.02.04</u>.</li> </ol>		Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/786,221 Page 2

Art Unit: 2645

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 12-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Szlam et al '688.

Szlam et al disclose in col. 2, lines 35-65, a telephone call processing system that minimizes the idle time of agents and the on-hold time of both called and calling parties, which in turn will maximize the utilization of the telephone trunks. Szlam et al disclose in Fig. 4, it is determined at Step 81 whether an agent is connected to call. Once an agent is connected to a call, then Szlam starts a duration timer and an excessive timer, col. 12, lines 9-11. In Step 84, it is determined whether an excessive time has been spent on the call. If an excessive time has spent by the agent on a call, then an alert is sent to the agent that excessive talk time has occurred and restarts the timer. For claim 2, Szlam 1st threshold reads upon the timer associated with the call duration. For claim 4, Szlam et al never specifically disclose that the contact is in "real-time", but inherently it is in real time because the phone calls are deemed happening in real-time.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

<sup>(</sup>a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-9, 11, 19-22, 24, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlam et al.

Szlam specifically disclose that their timers are started once the agent is connected. It would have been obvious to a person possessing ordinary skill in the call center to art for applicant to either when the contact is directed to an agent, when the contact is received by a communication device of an agent, when the contact is answered by an agent, or when the contact is graphically displayed on an agent's monitor. All of these alternate timer starting methods are deemed obvious modifications in view Szlam et al. disclosure of starting their timer when the agent is connected.

Claims 10 & 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kohler '770 – see col. 5, lines 50-60.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Creighton H.

Smith at telephone number 571/272-7546.

16 AUG '05

Creighton H Smith **Primary Examiner** Art Unit 2645